UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,954	10/23/2001	Geoffrey B. Rhoads	P0477	4464

23735 7590 02/03/2003

DIGIMARC CORPORATION
19801 SW 72ND AVENUE
SUITE 100
TUALATIN, OR 97062

EXAMINER
BLACKMAN, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2676	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/002,954	RHOADS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANTHONY J BLACKMAN	2676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 October 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MOSKOWITZ et al, US Patent No. 5,889,868 in view of MAUNEY et al, US Patent No. 5214,757.

3. Consider claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests digitally weatermarking image data to include imagery characteristics corresponding to a/the image data (abstract, lines 1-8 and column 2, lines 25-34), the image data acquired by an aerial platform (column 6, lines 9-45), however, does not expressly teach a method of compiling aerial imagery and generating a map therefrom; correlating the image data based on the imagery characteristics; and generating a map from the correlated image data. MAUNEY et al suggests a method of compiling aerial imagery and generating a map therefrom (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11); correlating the image data based on the imagery characteristics (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11); and generating a map from the correlated image data (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular

transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

4. Consider claim 2. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1, however, MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach or suggest the method according to claim 1, wherein the imagery characteristics comprise at least one of scale, rotation, altitude, attitude, resolution, time, imaging device type, azimuth and skew. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 1 of the underlined limitations, wherein the imagery characteristics comprise at least one of scale, rotation, altitude, attitude, resolution, time, imaging device type, azimuth and skew (column 2, lines 23-34).

5. Consider claim 3. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the following said digital watermarking step comprises embedding a watermark in each of the plurality of patches/locations (abstract, lines 1-8, column 2, lines 31-34, 58-61 and column 5, line 59 –column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2), however, does not expressly teach limitations for claim 3. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of segmenting the image data into a plurality of patches/locations (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11, and column 1, lines 8-16), and wherein, the watermark including imagery characteristics for its respective patch (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11, and column 1, lines 8-16).

7. Consider claim 4. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 4. MAUNEY et al

suggests the method according to claim 3, wherein said correlating step comprises adjusting image characteristics for at least one of the plurality of patches so that at least two adjacently positioned patches have similar imagery characteristics (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, and column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58).

8. Consider claim 5. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 5. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 3, wherein said generating step comprises the step of quilting the plurality of patches together to generate the map (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58).

9. Consider claim 6. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 6. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 1, wherein the aerial platform comprises at least one of the following underlined limitations of satellite, airplane, space shuttle, and unmanned aircraft (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16).

10. Consider claim 7. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the means of watermarking methods preserving quality of underlying signals to identify and highlight advantageous locations/patches for the insertion of digital watermark (column 2, lines 58-61), wherein the at least one watermark includes an index (abstract, lines 1-4, column 4, lines 18-32 and 32-48), however, does not expressly teach a method of managing aerial imagery; storing in a database a plurality of data records corresponding to a range of watermark indexes, wherein the data records comprise imagery characteristics. MAUNEY et al suggests

teach a method of managing aerial imagery (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58); storing in a database a plurality of data records corresponding to a range of watermark indexes (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58), wherein the data records comprise imagery characteristics (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

11. Consider claim 8. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 8. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 7, wherein said imagery characteristics comprise at least one of the following underlined limitation of scale, rotation, altitude, attitude, resolution, time, imaging device type, and skew (column 4, lines 25-38).

12. Consider claim 9. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the steps of steganographically encoding data in the form of a digital watermark in each of a plurality of patches/locations (abstract, lines 1-8, column 2, lines 25-34, column 4, lines 18-47, column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and

column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2), said encoded data including a location indicator (column 5, lines 59-66), however, does not expressly teach the a method of generating a map comprising; and piecing together the plurality of image patches based at least in part on the location indicator. MAUNEY et al suggests the a method of generating a map comprising; and piecing together the plurality of image patches based at least in part on the location indicator (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58). .

13. Consider claim 10. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 9. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 9, wherein the location indicator identifies the geo-coordinates of the patch (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58 and column 4, lines 25-38).

14. Consider claim 11. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 10. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 10, wherein the location indicator identifies the geo-coordinates for each corner of the respective patch (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58).

15. Consider claim 12. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 9. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 9, wherein the location indicator identifies a respective patch location relative to the map (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58).

16. Consider claim 13. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 9. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 9, wherein the location indicator identifies the respective patch location relative to at least one adjacent patch (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58).

17. Consider claim 14. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 1. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 9. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 9, wherein the location indicator comprises an index (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58), and said method further comprises the step of indexing a database with the index to retrieve location information (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58).

18. Consider claim 15. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests a method of correlating imagery data generated under a plurality of different conditions (abstract, lines 1-8 and column 2, lines 25-34), said method comprising the step of: embedding imagery characteristics in the imagery data (column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2), however, does not expressly teach modifying the imagery data based on the embedded imagery characteristics so as to standardize at least some of the imagery data. MAUNEY et al suggests modifying the imagery data based on the embedded imagery characteristics so as to standardize at least some of the imagery data (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive

mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

19. Consider claim 16. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 15. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 16. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 15, wherein said conditions comprise at least one of aerial platforms, altitude, time, cloud cover, resolution and scale (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11, column 2, lines 7-22, and column 4, lines25-38).

20. Consider claim 17. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 15. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 17. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 15, wherein said imagery characteristics comprise at least one of the following underlined limitations of scale, rotation, altitude, attitude, resolution, time, imaging device type, and skew (column 4, lines 25-38).

21. Consider claim 18. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 15. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 18. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 15, wherein said imagery characteristics comprise an index which is used to identify at least one of the following underlined

limitations of scale, rotation, altitude, attitude, resolution, time, imaging device type, and skew (column 4, lines 25-38).

22. Consider claim 19. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests a data structure stored on a computer readable medium, the data structure comprising an aerial image including an embedded watermark, however, does not expressly teach utilization of a geographic locator. MAUNEY et al suggests utilization of a geographic locator (column 4, lines 25-38). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

23. Consider claim 20. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests embedded data in the form of a digital watermark (abstract, lines 1-8, column 4, lines 18-47, column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2), said digital watermark including imagery characteristics, however, does not expressly teach a data structure stored on a computer readable medium, nor the data structure comprising an aerial image. MAUNEY et al suggests a data structure stored on a computer readable medium (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 3, lines 50-58), the data structure comprising an aerial image (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines

8-16, column 3, lines 50-58). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

24. Consider claim 21. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 20. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 21. MAUNEY et al suggests the data structure according to claim 20, wherein said imagery characteristics comprise an index which is used to identify at least one of the following underlined limitations of scale, rotation, altitude, attitude, resolution, time, imaging device type, and skew (column 4, lines 25-38).

25. Consider claim 22. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 20. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 22. MAUNEY et al suggests The data structure according to claim 20, wherein said imagery characteristics comprise at least one of the following underlined limitations of scale, rotation, altitude, attitude, resolution, time, imaging device type, and skew (column 4, lines 25-38).

26. Consider claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the means of digitally watermarking inserted locations (abstract, lines 1-8, column 4, lines 18-47, column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2), however, does not

expressly teach a method of marking a photograph comprising the steps of: obtaining geovector information corresponding to a location depicted in the photograph; and geovector information in the photograph. MAUNEY et al suggests a method of marking a photograph comprising the steps of: obtaining geovector information. It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

27. Consider claim 24. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 24. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 23, wherein geovector information comprises at least longitude and latitude coordinates (column 4, lines 25-38).

28. Consider claim 25. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 24. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 25, wherein said geovector information further comprises at least height, time, cardinal direction, and azimuth (column 4, lines 25-38).

29. Consider claim 26. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 26. MAUNEY et al

suggests the method according to claim 23, wherein the geovector information comprises a pointer (column 6, line 34 to column 7, line 3 and column 8, line 40 to column 9, line 12).

30. Consider claim 27. . MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 26. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 26, further comprising the steps of storing geovector information in a database (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11) and accessing the geovector information via the pointer (column 6, line 34 to column 7, line 3 and column 8, line 40 to column 9, line 12).

31. Consider claim 28. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 28. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 23, wherein the geovector information is obtained from a GPS receiver (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11).

32. Consider claim 29. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 26. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 23, wherein the geovector information is obtained after the photograph is taken (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58).

33. Consider claim 30. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 23. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 30. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 23, further comprising the step of accessing a database to obtain information regarding the area depicted in the photograph (figure 1,

and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58).

34. Consider claim 31. MOSKOWITZ et al disclose digitally watermarking location information in an object, however, does not expressly teach linking the information to at least one data record. MAUNEY et al suggests teach linking the information to at least one data record (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

35. Consider claim 32. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 31. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 32. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 31, wherein the location information comprises at least longitude and latitude (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11, column 4, lines 25-38).

36. Consider claim 33. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 32. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 33. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 32, wherein the object comprises at least one

of the following underlined limitations a document, bracelet, collar, ID document, tag, map, photograph, stationary, and envelop column 2, lines 7-22).

37. Consider claim 34. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 31. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 34. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 31, wherein the location information comprises a geovector including information relating to at least one of the following underlined limitations longitude, latitude, time, azimuth, cardinal direction, height and sensory characteristics (figure 1 and column 4, lines 25-38).

38. Consider claim 35. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests an article of manufacture comprising steganographically embedded data in the form of a digital watermark, however, does not expressly teach that the watermark comprising location information, MAUNEY et al suggests location information (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11, column 4, lines 25-38).

39. Consider claim 36. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 31. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 36. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 35, wherein the location information comprises a geovector comprising at least longitude and latitude information (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58).

40. Consider claim 37. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 36. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 37. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 37, wherein the geovector further comprises

information corresponding to time, azimuth, cardinal direction, and height (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58).

41. Consider claim 38. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 37. MOSKOWITZ et al does not expressly teach limitations for claim 38. MAUNEY et al suggests the method according to claim 37, wherein the geovector further comprises information corresponding to sensor geometry (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58).

42. Consider claim 39. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests a method of notarizing a document, and the means of embedding the geovector in the document in the form of a digital watermark, however, does not expressly teach the steps of obtaining a geovector and, the geovector comprising date and location information. MAUNEY et al suggests the steps of obtaining a geovector (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11 and column 1, lines 8-16) and, the geovector comprising date and location information (figure 1 and column 4, lines 25-38). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

43. Consider claim 40. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the means of insertion of digital watermarking in highly advantageous locations, however, does not expressly teach method of making a map comprising the steps of: obtaining first geovector information corresponding to at least a first region to be depicted by the map; and digitally watermarking the first geovector information in the map. MAUNEY et al suggests a method of making a map (figure 1, abstract, lines 1-11) comprising the steps of: obtaining first geovector information corresponding to at least a first region to be depicted by the map (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58); and digitally watermarking the first geovector information in the map (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to utilize the interactive mapping system, including GPS (satellite) and GIS (database) systems of MAUNEY et al with the "...implementations of digital watermarks that are optimally suited to a particular transmission, distribution and storage mediums given the nature of digitally-sampled audio, video, and other multimedia works" (column 2, lines 25-34) of MOSKOWITZ et al because both inventions share similar technological areas relating to receiving, storing, implementing and modifying digitized signals from similar storage/database systems.

44. Consider claim 41. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the method according to claim 40, wherein said watermarking step comprises embedding the first geovector information only in the first region (abstract, lines 1-8, column 4, lines 17-49, column n5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2).

45. Consider claim 42. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 41. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the method according to claim 41, further comprising obtaining second geovector information corresponding to at least a second region to be depicted by the map (abstract, lines 1-8, column 4, lines 17-49, column n5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2). And digitally watermarking the second geovector information in the map (abstract, lines 1-8, column 4, lines 17-49, column n5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2).

46. Consider claim 43. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations of claim 42. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the method according to claim 42, wherein said the second geovector information is only embedded in the second region (abstract, lines 1-8, column 4, lines 17-49, column n5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2).

47. Consider claim 44. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified does not expressly teach the limitations of claim 44. MAUNEY et al suggests that the method according to claim 40, wherein the first region comprises at least one of a fire hydrant, tree, road, building, lake, stream, forest, manhole, water line, gas line, power line, park, property line, fence, boarder, depot, geographical area, stadium, hospital, school, church, store and airport (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58).

48. Consider claim 45. MOSKOWITZ et al as modified meet limitations for claim 40. MOSKOWITZ et al suggests the method according to claim 40, wherein said watermarking step comprises digitally watermarking means (abstract, lines 1-8, column

4, lines 17-49, column n5, line 59 to column 6, line 8 and column 7, line 29 to column 8, line 2), however, does not expressly teach the first geovector information redundantly throughout the map. MAUNEY et al suggests the first geovector information redundantly throughout the map (figure 1, and abstract, lines 1-11, column 1, lines 8-16, column 2, lines 7-22, column 3, lines 50-58).

Conclusion

49. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. WONG, Ping Wah, EPO 953938A2; BHASKARAN, EPO 947953A2; RHOADS, US Patent No. 6,122,403; MURPHY et al, US Patent No. 6,282,362; LEIGHTON, US Patent No. 5,664,018; NATARJAN, WO 99/17537; NARYANASWAMI et al, US Patent no. 6,504,571; and MINTZER et al, US Patent No. 5,875,249.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY J BLACKMAN whose telephone number is 703-305-0833. The examiner canthermally be reached on FLEX SCHEDULE.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW BELLA can be reached on 703-308-6829. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-746-5731 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ANTHONY J BLACKMAN
Examiner
Art Unit 2676

***

January 25, 2003

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600